



INTRODUCTION

Art History, Aesthetics, and the Body After Archaeology

In 1873, scholar and aesthete Walter Pater wrote a biographical essay on Johann Joachim Winckelmann, the eighteenth-century antiquarian and scholar whom art historians tend to recognize as the “father” of the discipline of art history. Pater observed, “To most of us, after all our steps towards it, the antique world, in spite of its intense outlines, its own perfect self-expression, still remains faint and remote. To [Winckelmann], . . . it clearly came to seem more real than the present.”¹ In a 1768 portrait by Anton von Maron, Winckelmann is depicted as if caught in the midst of work on his *Monumenti antichi inediti* (Unpublished antique monuments) (fig. 1). This two-volume book, published the previous year in Rome, is alluded to by the strategic inclusion of the manuscript in the painting’s foreground and an engraving of the Roman relief of Antinous (then in the Villa Albani), which Winckelmann reproduced



FIGURE 1 Anton von Maron, *Portrait of Winckelmann*, 1768. Oil on canvas. Klassik Stiftung, Weimar. Photo: Wikimedia Commons.

FIGURE 2 Niccolò Mogalli, after Nikolaus Mosman, *Antinous Bas-Relief*, 1767. Engraving from Johann Joachim Winckelmann, *Monumenti antichi inediti* (Rome, 1767), vol. 1: cat. no. 180.



and discussed in his text (fig. 2).² It is a portrait that radiates intellectual vitality. Winckelmann, eyes sparkling, with his gesturing arm somewhat akimbo, takes up a dynamic pose—here is thought in action, if ever there was—his body’s dimensionality and its liveliness telegraphed by the light radiating off his garments and by the punctuations of the fur tumbling from neck to ground.

In this image, Winckelmann stands in stark juxtaposition to his antique interlocutors. Homer is conjured on the right by way of an empty-eyed bust. Antinous, while benefiting from the “intense outlines” of copperplate engraving, is summoned in reduced—and reproduced—monochromatic form, an allusion to what Pater acknowledged as the challenge faced by a scholar who “had to penetrate

Greek art through copies, imitations, and later Roman art itself.”³ To fully grasp this tension—an invitation the picture surely offers to its viewers—it is worth noting that the fur is more than merely trim; the bushy warmth escaping from the sleeve’s edge signals that this coat is fur-lined. Its sparkling crimson exterior effects a visceral inversion: the inside is here made over into spectacular, pulsating outside. Von Maron’s portrait is thus an especially apt reference point for reconsidering Pater’s insight: it is no small matter for Winckelmann to surmount the chasm of history and live among the ancients. He does so, in Pater’s text, as in von Maron’s portrait and in Winckelmann’s own account of his work, by way of his extended, direct communion with the artifacts of antiquity.

Writing only a few years after Pater, author and theorist Vernon Lee (born Violet Paget) likewise considered the challenges that material traces of the antique posed to contemporary spectators. In her 1881 essay “The Child in the Vatican,” Lee set her sights on the art museum, the institutional setting in which such encounters had, from the mid-eighteenth century, been framed. Lee was preoccupied by a particular scenario: museumgoers beholding ancient sculpture. In her estimation, the Vatican, boasting one of the earliest and foremost collections of ancient sculpture, was “eminently a place of exile; or worse, of captivity, for all this people of marble: these athletes and nymphs and satyrs, and warriors and poets and gods” (18). Admitting that “galleries are necessary things, to save pictures and statues (or the little remaining of them),” Lee observed that they are nevertheless “evil necessities” inasmuch as “a sort of negative vandalism always clings to them, specially to the galleries of statues, so uninhabited, so utterly sepulchral” (18). For Lee, the problem of the art museum was bound up with a more

particular concern. “We ask ourselves,” she writes, “whether in reality this antique art is, in the life of our feelings, at all important, comforting, influential? We shall, for the most part, whisper back to ourselves that it is not so in the very least” (23).

In her anxious reflections on whether the antique had lost its affective power, Lee demonstrates a sensibility well established by the second half of the nineteenth century, one that still powerfully informs contemporary art-historical analysis. This perspective turned on a seductive series of associations: the sculptural antique was conceived as remote and cold, resolutely antimodern, and it thus left spectators uncomprehending, if not themselves deadened. As demonstrated by the phenomenal 2018 exhibition and catalogue *Like Life: Sculpture, Color, and the Body*, these tensions remain central and are arguably axiomatic to figural sculpture.⁴ Lee’s reflections feature here as a late episode in a history that has yet to be written: a history of encounters with ancient Greco-Roman sculpture between 1750 and 1900 and their Janus-faced nature, as beholders and sculptures were caught between the promise of animation and the threat of mortification. Von Maron’s portrait figures within a rich record of instances in which sculptural encounters, both experienced and imagined, were depicted in two-dimensional representations, from drawing and print mediums to painting and photography. Through the analysis of a series of such striking episodes, this book offers a new understanding of the distinctive ontology of ancient sculpture that animated wide-ranging eighteenth- and nineteenth-century artistic imaginaries.

My account begins in Italy in the decades following the rediscoveries of Herculaneum and Pompeii in the Bay of Naples circa 1750, when a new and distinctively eighteenth-century conception of the nature of antique sculpture began to be consolidated.

It ends in the final decades of the nineteenth century, when Lee and her intimate collaborator, artist Clementina Anstruther-Thomson, were at work on their “Gallery Diaries” around the same time that proliferating photographic depictions of sculpture converged with a new insistence on sculpture’s planarity. The intervening century and a half witnessed fraught negotiations over what constituted the antique as well as what significance it could be understood to have for contemporary life. This study examines pictorial traces of affective and transformative sculptural encounters, beginning with the uptake of archaeological, art-historical, and art-philosophical developments in the mid-eighteenth century and culminating in the anthropological, psychological, and empathic frameworks that emerged at the cusp of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. An alternative account of the modernity of antique sculpture takes shape here, in which “modernity” is understood not in terms of iconographic and stylistic change but as a process bound up with the imagined promises and threats that encounters with a set of curiously enduring forms seemed to offer. At the heart of my account is the assertion that the analysis of artists’ attempts to render sculptural encounter in two dimensions opens up a new understanding of sculpture in the round as it was conceived, thought through, and experienced in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

The Sleeping (Borghese) Hermaphrodite of 1765 is a case in point (fig. 3). This antique sculpture figures in an extraordinary series of grisaille paintings after famed antiquities executed by French artist Louis-Gabriel Blanchet. The picture is almost certainly the product of Blanchet’s firsthand encounter with its antique referent at the Villa Borghese. It may well have been completed with recourse to large-scale engravings after the antique,

FIGURE 3 Louis-Gabriel Blanchet, *The Sleeping (Borghese) Hermaphrodite*, 1765. Oil on canvas. Saltram House, National Trust. Photo © National Trust Images / Matthew Hollow.

FIGURE 4 Nan Goldin, *The Hermaphrodite Sleeping, Le Louvre*. From *Scopophilia*, 2010. Photo courtesy of the artist and Marian Goodman Gallery © Nan Goldin.



like those found in Blanchet's studio after his death.⁵ The final canvas thus would have invoked real and reimagined experiences of sculptural viewing, even as it subjected the figure's famously unruly physiology—a revelation that turned, as it were, on spectators' movements around the sculpture—to the conventions of planar representation. These operations are beautifully, if arguably more violently, captured in Nan Goldin's more recent picturing of the Sleeping Hermaphrodite in the Louvre (fig. 4). Here, the polysemy of the sculptural figure's anatomy, typically revealed over time and

through space, is markedly fixed, not unlike a pinned butterfly.

Blanchet's painting frames a strikingly different view onto the sculpture. The Hermaphrodite appears as if washed ashore (evoking Francis Bacon's understanding of antiquities as "remnants of history which have casually escaped the shipwreck of time") amid other marble remnants of the antique, tumbled together in a vast museum store-room.⁶ Massive stone slabs impinge upon the space of the figure in the foreground and, more precipitously, in the background. There, fragments are stacked together, puzzlelike, in a form evocative of the work of Blanchet's fellow Roman, Giovanni Battista Piranesi, whose 1762 *Campus Martius antiquae urbis* (The field of Mars in ancient Rome) was packed to bursting with trompe l'oeil stone slabs, notionally reassembled, as in the volume's title page and its immense "Ichnographiam Campi Martii" (fig. 5). When fully unfolded, Piranesi's monumental composition pushes at the limits of the laws of perspective and of physics. Taking the form of a massive, reconstructed map carved on stone, Piranesi's representation pictures broken segments held together by depicted metal brackets (presumably attached to a wall), even as the accretion of further loose (and thereby ostensibly gravity-defying) stone fragments on top of the stone map's foundation threaten the composition's planar logic.

Unsecured by clamps, Blanchet's slabs, riddled with fractures, insert an ominous note into the composition, even as they draw attention to the surprising sense of movement that infuses the artist's ode to marble. When encountered in the museum, the Borghese Hermaphrodite's chilly sinuosity of form provides an apt mirror for the figure's self-contained, introspective mien, its eyes closed as in sleep. In Blanchet's hands, however, the

figure is amplified in a fleshier rendition of the body, and it is captured in a pose of twisting torsion. Set atop Gian Lorenzo Bernini's signature mattress, which is canted up like an inflatable raft on choppy waters, the figure appears to struggle with pillow and sheets, twisting and turning as if in the midst of a violent dream. These spatial manipulations strongly suggest that the figure, along with its stony accoutrements, is in danger of sliding into the viewer's lap. In this way, Blanchet's picture is uncannily redolent of mausoleum, museum, and bed-chamber all at once. Blanchet's *Hermaphrodite* is less a sculpture than a body among the ruins. The picture's gripping strangeness turns above all on Blanchet's dramatic exploration of a confrontation between the plastic (or sculptural) and the pictorial.

Such transformations, or transitions, of figural sculpture from three dimensions to two forced artists and beholders to confront the fundamental dynamics of sculpture-in-experience, operations that form the very core of *Animating the Antique*. Examining works like Blanchet's allows an exhumation of eighteenth-century understandings of the shifting nature of ancient sculpture. In stark contrast to Goldin's photograph, Blanchet's *Hermaphrodite* conjures and attempts to hold in equipoise vivacity and deathliness, together with the related antinomies of warmth and coldness, movement and fixity, present and past. In so doing, it opens a window onto an eighteenth-century ontology of the antique that had far-reaching ramifications in the making and beholding of modern art, in the articulations of art theory, and also in the writing of art history.

Animating the Antique turns on two essential and interconnected arguments: that an eighteenth-century ontology of ancient sculpture continued to inform encounters with the antique well into the

FIGURE 5 Giovanni Battista Piranesi, "Ichnographiam Campi Martii." Engraving from Piranesi, *Campus Martius antiquae urbis*, 1762. Yale University Art Gallery, New Haven, Connecticut.



nineteenth century, and that attending to the enduring power of this model equips us to newly appreciate the distinctively modern terms of antique sculpture's allure: its mobility, mutability, and capacity for transformative encounter. At the heart of the matter are episodes of imagined vivification and transformation, understood through the pictorial traces left by artists who worked to render in

two-dimensional mediums figural sculpture seen and experienced in the round. I examine these encounters—framed by the tension between sculpture viewed in time and space and its translation into two-dimensional representation—in order to gauge the changing emphasis placed on the process of apprehending and viewing sculpture, to track varying models of ideal viewing positions, and,

crucially, to evaluate shifting assumptions about gendered viewing.

A wide range of materials is brought to bear in the chapters that follow: drawings and paintings, engraving and photography, travel accounts and gallery diaries, literary descriptions and philosophical texts. Of central importance is the question of how sculptural encounters, at once material and imagined, were given visual form in works of art and in the artistic processes through which they came into being. What emerges is a new account in which sculpture's gelid and mortifying capacities are shown to be intimately linked to the animating, vivifying, and transformative power that was associated with beholding antique sculpture. This structural dialectic cut both ways, ensnaring beholder and sculpture even as it underwrote artistic, philosophical, and touristic encounters alike.

As the episodes that follow attest, one of the book's primary claims is that an eighteenth-century ontology of the antique may be charted well into the late nineteenth century. Careful scrutiny of this trajectory provides a new sense of the connective tissues that bind together periods and materials that have tended to be treated in isolation. Spanning the period between roughly 1750 and 1900, this study redresses an art-historical literature shaped profoundly by narratives of artistic revolution and avant-garde rupture that tend to enshrine, whether explicitly or tacitly, a radical break between the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. *Animating the Antique* reveals instead long-overlooked continuities across the modern period. Certainly, encounters with ancient sculpture in the nineteenth century frequently elicited highly charged aesthetic responses, whereby sculptural form functioned as a time-collapsing pivot, bringing past and present into contact. While chronologically wide-ranging,

the artists and works of art included here are firmly connected by their common orientation to issues of apprehension, touch, and sight, themes that were thrown into relief through modern encounters with antique figural sculpture. As the book's materials vividly attest, such embodied experiences could precipitate self-reflection or self-discovery, with powerful implications for our understanding of desire and subjecthood.

PICTURING SCULPTURE AFTER THE AESTHETIC TURN

Scholarship examining the afterlives of ancient sculpture has tended to follow several well-charted tracks. Classical reception studies have explored eighteenth- and nineteenth-century philological and artistic reckonings with Greek and Roman antiquities. A rich literature in grand-tour studies has plumbed touristic itineraries, social networks, and collecting habits to reveal the pleasures and perils attendant on encounters with art in an age of international travel. Scholarship focused on historical shifts in the collecting, exhibition, and display of antiquities has revealed significant transformations in these practices between 1750 and 1900. The vitality of these lines of inquiry has dramatically reconfigured our understanding of what has come to be known as "the long eighteenth century" and has, among other things, significantly expanded our sense of the period's visual and material culture, including its artworks, objects, and makers.

At the same time, scholars have identified the eighteenth century as a moment distinguished by an outpouring of art-theoretical and philosophical reflection about aesthetic experience or about what is entailed in subjective encounters that stimulate the senses, passions, and judgments of beauty.⁷

These eighteenth-century preoccupations built upon what David Summers demonstrates were significantly earlier considerations of aesthetic knowledge and perception, particularly the “new” definition of the beholder’s point of view as individual and subjective that surfaced in the early modern (late medieval, early Renaissance) period. According to Summers, the “language of the particular intellect” that developed in the Renaissance provided a foundation for modern aesthetics, especially “the kinds of judgment belonging to the making and viewing of works of art.”⁸ The eighteenth century was not the sole point of origin for ideas understood as specifically modern interventions into aesthetic thought. Nevertheless, it is significant that the term “aesthetics” emerged during this time, and even more crucially, central concepts for thinking through artistic encounter and experience, including “taste” and “sentiment,” took on their modern meaning.⁹ While reflections on representation, mimesis, and the dynamics of viewing works of art had long featured in writing about art, as Andrew Ashfield and Peter de Bolla have observed, “it fell to [the eighteenth century] in particular to articulate the complexities of affective experience.”¹⁰

Although earlier intimations may be tracked to the late seventeenth century, Jean-Baptiste Dubos’s 1719 *Critical Reflections on Poetry and Painting* (translated into English in 1748) decisively signaled an “aesthetic turn,” insofar as it situated the beholder’s feeling—construed as sentiment and sensibility—as the primary, if not exclusive, criterion for judging artistic accomplishment.¹¹ This vital shift, from the scrutiny of art objects to an emphasis on subjective experience, only became more pronounced in subsequent publications and would inform writing and thinking about aesthetics for

decades to come. In his 1757 “Of the Standard of Taste,” David Hume emphatically embraced it, asserting, in Ernst Cassirer’s admirably efficient resumé, that “all value judgments as such are concerned not with the thing itself and its absolute nature, but rather with a certain relation existing between the objects and ourselves as perceiving, feeling and judging subjects.”¹² In the decades after Alexander Gottlieb Baumgarten’s coining of the term “aesthetic” in 1735, aesthetic experience was conceived as a reciprocal encounter between the art object and its sensate, beholding subject.¹³

As Hume’s writing attests, such explorations of aesthetic experience were closely tied to crucial epistemological shifts in the understanding of human subjectivity so that, in Ashfield and de Bolla’s view, “what the period said and thought about artworks [was] bound up with what it thought and said about the nature of human experience more generally.”¹⁴ The rise of aesthetic theory was intimately linked to claims articulated by Lord Shaftesbury and Joseph Addison about the role of the art critic and was thereby intertwined with new conceptions of the fine arts and an expanded topography of amateurs, critics, and a novel public for art.¹⁵ As Jacqueline Lichtenstein argues, by the mid-1750s, “three new regimes” had emerged: the interlocking discourses of aesthetics and art history (both with origins in Germany) and art criticism (with origins in France).¹⁶

In the age of the grand tour’s ascendancy and in light of philosophical reflections on affective experience, encounters with Greco-Roman sculptural artifacts were shaped by new pressures and expectations. Such expanded horizons, born of pivotal Enlightenment debates and explorations, had formative effects on painting and sculpture. Taking the measure of these shifts requires interweaving an

examination of philosophical and art-theoretical literatures in tandem with histories of art making and beholding. By foregrounding historical situations of beholding and by excavating the traces of the imaginative and material operations involved in artists' transformation of the plastic to the pictorial, I offer a new understanding of how these sea changes registered in the realms of representation and art making.

The origins of the compelling rhetorical marriage of antiquity, sculpture, and morbidity have been traced to the seventeenth-century founding of the French Académie des Beaux-Arts and to the *paragone*, or contest between painting and sculpture.¹⁷ I address this rhetorical tradition with an eye toward how the discursive realm of art-critical and art-philosophical writing intersected with the world of art making in the period in question. A further historiographic tendency, which I would argue is linked to the *paragone* debates of the long modern period, is the separate treatment of painting and sculpture in art-historical accounts, despite the predominance of academic systems in which artistic training was shaped by the intermingling of painters and sculptors. In this way, scholarly analysis has tacitly adopted the habits of mind signaled by the *paragone*, which emphasized, above all, distinctions between the pictorial and spatial arts.¹⁸ In this study, devoted to the analysis of two-dimensional representations of objects that existed in three dimensions, interactions between the arts—whether manifested by friction, contest, or continuities of translation—necessarily take center stage.

EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY THRESHOLDS

By the eighteenth century, masterworks of ancient sculpture had long been the focus of connoisseurial and artistic admiration. In the Renaissance, artists



FIGURE 6 Nicolas Beatrizet, *Laocoön and His Sons*, ca. 1520–65. Engraving. Photo © Victoria and Albert Museum, London.

and art enthusiasts had embraced such finds as the Apollo Belvedere, which, in Leonard Barkan's admirable turn of phrase, "reentered the world circa 1490."¹⁹ Myriad prints, drawings, and sculptures after the celebrated Laocoön group attest to the avidity with which the work was received after its 1506 rediscovery, ultimately making it the most famous of all antiquities in the sixteenth century (fig. 6). While an enthusiasm for these and other disinterred artifacts was palpable during the Renaissance, encounters with ancient sculpture took new form and opened up newly resonant associations, expectations, and meanings in the eighteenth century. Eighteenth-century artists and their

FIGURE 7 Hubert Robert, *The Finding of the Laocoön*, 1773. Oil on canvas. Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, Richmond. Arthur and Margaret Glasgow Fund. Photo © Virginia Museum of Fine Arts (Katherine Wetzel).



contemporaries were particularly enthralled by the sixteenth-century rediscovery of famed antiquities, as Hubert Robert's monumental painting from 1773, *The Finding of the Laocoön*, attests (fig. 7). Robert's painting conjures a scene of explicitly sixteenth-century revelation, communicated by the clothing worn by the assembled workers and onlookers as well as the Raphaelesque architectural setting within which the drama of discovery unfolds. Nonetheless, his rendition of spectacular sculptural encounter is clearly the product of a distinctively eighteenth-century nexus. In the second half of the century, expanding circuits of European tourism, burgeoning archaeological activity (above all, the discoveries of Herculaneum and Pompeii in 1738 and 1748, respectively), and the establishment of public art museums (notably the Capitoline in 1734

and the Vatican Pio-Clementino in 1770, both in Rome, and the Louvre in 1793 in Paris) enabled unprecedented access to these objects for a growing art public, including artists, tourists, and locals. Encounters with antique sculpture were facilitated by the grand tour's typical itinerary of cultural pilgrimage, which featured stops in Florence, Rome, and Naples, even as technologies of reproduction, utilizing plaster, porcelain, or print mediums, allowed for the dissemination of prized artifacts to an expanding pan-European network of collectors and readers.

Vitally important eighteenth-century developments, including the rise of aesthetics, modern archaeology, the modern art museum, and the foundations of art history, contributed to antique sculpture's newly consolidated artistic and

art-philosophical centrality, which in turn produced new expectations for encounters with and responses to the antique. The archaeological discoveries made in the Bay of Naples around 1750 were experienced as an eighteenth-century analogue to the lunar landing of 1969, bringing a new material reality to visions of the antique previously confined to the partial, the fragment, and the ruin. Spectacular revelations of singular antiquities like the Laocoön group had earlier marked the sixteenth century, as had the desire to bring together monumental antique vestiges with views of the modern metropolis in ambitious projects such as Antonio Lafreri's sixteenth-century *Speculum romanae magnificentiae* (Mirror of Roman magnificence). However, conceptions of antiquity profoundly shifted in light of large-scale archaeological discoveries at Herculaneum and Pompeii. Visitors to Pompeii were struck by the altogether new proximity to the past offered up by the "mummified city" (invoked by Johann Wolfgang von Goethe in 1787), where they took in "the whole affecting scene of ruins" (in the words of William Beckford in 1780), or in Herculaneum, where one could travel down in wicker baskets to subterranean chambers filled with remains, both artistic and human.²⁰ Forged in these sites, new practices of archaeology collapsed the distance between past and present while instilling a newly materialized, and increasingly systematized, vision of antiquity imagined in the aftermath of ruin and excavation.

Throughout the nineteenth century, thinking about the antique was reshaped by new archaeological revelations, from the Elgin Parthenon and Aegina marbles in the first decades of the century, to ongoing discoveries about polychromy, and excavations at Mycenae and Pergamon in the 1870s and early 1880s. The rise of anthropological

approaches, together with more rigorously scientific archaeological exploration and analysis, gained ground over the course of the nineteenth century. Idealizing explanatory schemes, like those of Johann Joachim Winckelmann and Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, began to be challenged and displaced by the likes of Richard Payne Knight, Antoine-Chrysostôme Quatremère de Quincy, Walter Pater, and Eugénie Sellers. Far from an immutable ideal or iconographic constant, conceptions of the antique between 1750 and 1900 were volatile, fraught, and contested. At the same time, figural sculptures from ancient Greece and Rome endured as key touchpoints in powerfully affective artistic encounters and as the focus of tremendous intellectual and creative energies.

In a period marked by wide-ranging antiquarian and scholarly efforts to excavate antique origins and genealogies, the "antique" was a strikingly polysemous concept, both in terms of associated objects and imagined origins. At the same time, Greco-Roman antiquity was understood in dialogue with an imagined "living antique" that indigenous populations, in North America, Africa, and elsewhere, were thought to embody. Upon encountering the Apollo Belvedere in 1760, Benjamin West famously declared, "My God, how like it is to a young Mohawk warrior!"²¹ Like West, Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Winckelmann both saw echoes of ancient Greece in Native American cultures, while the North African and Middle Eastern subjects of nineteenth-century orientalist paintings were likewise conceived as living vestiges of a surviving antiquity.

Alternative visions of the antique also informed the recuperation of divergent histories and forms situated in the distant past. The Comte de Caylus (Anne-Claude-Philippe de Tubières) and Pierre-Jean Mariette, for instance, were invested in an

expanded conception of the antique by way of, as Kristel Smentek has observed, their interest in artifacts from China.²² Nevertheless, the universe of Greco-Roman objects garnered the sustained convergence of aesthetic, touristic, and museological attention that formed the ground plan for an eighteenth-century ontology of the antique. Archaeological exploration, including its literatures, analytics, and imagery, features as a backbone of this study, from its eighteenth-century incarnations through the more systematic studies undertaken by Emanuel Löwy, Adolf Furtwängler, and others at the end of the nineteenth century. These dynamics are a particular focus of chapter 3, which considers experiences and images of the sculptural antique in the context of the Bay of Naples.

Accelerated archaeological activity in the mid-eighteenth century dovetailed with the emergence of the public art museum. As pictorial depictions and textual accounts of visiting the Roman collections of the Capitoline and Vatican Museo Pio-Clementino attest, the advent of the public museum was, at its origins, closely tied to the collection and display of antique sculpture, since these artifacts constituted the core of a number of early public museum collections.²³ In the decades around midcentury, new exhibition practices further emphasized the importance of individual objects, which were reframed and isolated for special attention from the all-over decorative schemes that had prevailed in the baroque installations characteristic of earlier private collections.²⁴ This type of display was particularly striking in the case of sculpture, which, with the advent of public museums, became accessible to a broader range of viewers. Publications documenting these collections, such as Giovanni Gaetano Bottari and Niccolò Foggini's *Del Museo Capitolino* (1741–82), played a role in this

process; this volume's pairing of image with descriptive text effectively standardized the format that remains the convention even to this day.²⁵

Spaces of museum collections and experiences within them feature prominently throughout the book, notably in chapter 2, where the installation of antiquities, first in Rome and then in Paris, is considered both in terms of the highly loaded nationalist stakes that marked the foundations of the Louvre Museum and relative to luxury print productions whose two-dimensional representations aimed to capture the spatial and temporal experience of the museum. Chapter 3 takes up the circulation of quite different museum artifacts: photographs produced beginning in the 1860s by Giorgio Sommer, Michele Amodio, and others depicting the newly created plaster casts that from 1873 greeted visitors to Pompeii's site museum. Chapter 4, anchored by Lee and Anstruther-Thomson's efforts to animate art and, above all, sculpture, takes up a project that was ideologically and practically situated in dialogue with contemporary exhibition spaces.

A new and urgent sense of art's historicity also emerged in the eighteenth century. Bernard de Montfaucon's *L'antiquité expliquée et représentée en figures* (1719) put the object, its apperception, and its representation at the forefront: "By this term antiquity I only mean *that which can be seen in front of one's eyes and may be represented in images*. . . . If what has to do with laws, government, and the policing of cities and republics is sometimes considered, it is only by chance. We would say the same for chronology and geography."²⁶ The object stands at the center of Montfaucon's project, albeit as understood through the lens of philological explication, with recourse to ancient texts. While this method proved essential to emergent archaeological

approaches, missing is a sense of historical development or an overarching scheme, much less a rigorous conception of the interrelations between morphology and historical origins.²⁷ In subsequent decades, compendia of collections like those published by Caylus and Mariette reflected a newly emphatic focus on objects and attested to an epistemic shift that, as Arnaldo Momigliano has emphasized, entailed both a “revolution in taste” and “a revolution in historical method.”²⁸ It was only in the decades immediately following the discoveries of Herculaneum and Pompeii, with Winckelmann’s 1764 *The History of the Art of Antiquity*, that objects would be scrupulously described and presented within a systematic structure.²⁹ Henceforth, the form and meaning of works of art were understood to be inextricably linked to the historical situation of their creation, which was capaciously conceived to include politics, climate, and geography.³⁰ Traces of this Winckelmannian heritage persisted, and they are the focus of sustained analysis throughout this book. This strand culminates in chapter 4, in Pater’s and Lee’s embrace of Winckelmann as a key forefather and in the long-term refinement of an essentially Winckelmannian model in the accounts of sculpture in the ancient world written by Löwy and Furtwängler (and Sellers).³¹

Winckelmann’s approach is emblematic insofar as it cannot be understood solely through the lens of antiquarian and archaeological preoccupations. In its distinctive admixture of historicism and subjectivity, it bears the traces of another crucial eighteenth-century development: philosophical inquiry that emphatically centered on bodily sensations and aesthetic experience, thereby placing altogether new pressures on the spectator’s embodied encounter with works of art. Many, if not all, of

the objects and episodes that animate this book resonate with what David Freedberg has famously termed the “power of images” and with more recent explorations of object agency or, in Caroline van Eck’s formulation, “living presence response.”³² Again and again, eighteenth- and nineteenth-century beholders wrote about and gave pictorial form to their understanding that antique sculpture had the capacity to exceed its static, marmoreal bounds and approximate the pulsations of life, even as it stimulated heightened sensations on the part of the spectator. I do not aim here to contest the degree to which the imagined power of art objects—or artifacts, to follow a Gellian inquiry into the ways in which art may be seen to be endowed with agency—may be considered fundamental to the category “art.”³³ Certainly, cases in which artworks are perceived as life-imbued agents represent a significant motif in the history of art writing from at least as early as Pliny and Callistratus in the first and third (or fourth) centuries CE.³⁴ While taking into account the transhistorical nature of art’s power, agency, and capacity for lifelikeness, this book reveals the degree to which the eighteenth century was a pivotal, even transformative, episode in this history, an assertion that forms its backbone.

Building upon earlier seventeenth-century developments, watershed texts by Isaac Newton and John Locke had profound implications for the early decades of the eighteenth century. The decades following Locke’s publication of *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* in 1690 were marked by a surge in inquiry, spanning scholarly and popular realms, that focused on empirically based, experiential operations of sensation and perception. In what Michael Baxandall describes as an age of “vulgar Lockeanism,” a preoccupation with perception and the essential role of perceiving subjects was

omnipresent, from philosophical texts to popular manuals such as Francesco Algarotti's best-selling *Newtonianism for the Ladies* of 1737.³⁵ This focus on the necessarily interactive operations of sensory impressions produced by the perceiving subject's encounter with "Nature" (or, in Locke's term, "Substance") that together contributed to the mind's perception likewise had important implications for the analysis of encounters with art. Important publications by Dubos and Shaftesbury were emblematic of an eighteenth-century efflorescence of post-Lockean reflection on what encounters with art entailed, as well as judgments and experiences of beauty (or the lack thereof).

Increasingly, in the eighteenth century, the value of a work of art depended less on its adherence to accepted rules than on its ability to move its beholders, to stimulate their senses and passions. This significant shift meant that aesthetic experience was newly conceived as a quasi-intersubjective encounter between artwork and beholder. Against this backdrop, as David Marshall observes, "Extravagant claims for the ideal experience of art appear to have been translated into extravagant expectations for and demands upon the experience of art."³⁶ One node of investigation into particularly "extravagant" experience was Edmund Burke's theorization of the sublime in his 1757 treatise *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful*. Engaged with crucial precursors in Longinus (*On the Sublime*, first century CE) and Nicolas Boileau's translation and commentary on Longinus's text, Burke strategically shifted the discursive center of gravity that informed the work of Longinus and Boileau, where a balance was struck between an examination of rhetorical traditions, or styles, and the experience of beholders and spectators. Even as Burke summoned

a new topography of the sublime as it was elicited by vistas and objects redolent of the infinite and obscure, the vast and powerful, and so on, his interest was, above all, in a symptomatology of the sublime (and beautiful). The experiences and sensations stimulated by such encounters were, in fact, at the core of his inquiry.³⁷

The critical point here is that while the sublime stands as a sort of limit case (and was not often invoked to describe encounters with sculpture), it is exemplary of a more extensive eighteenth-century preoccupation with and theorization of the receptivity and sensitivity of beholders. This preoccupation was indispensable to thinking through aesthetic encounters in general terms, whether in philosophical texts such as Burke's, in period novels, or in myriad diaries and letters from those making the grand tour. Such traces are evident in sculptor Étienne Falconet's *Reflections on Sculpture* from 1761, in which he asserted that the sculptor's craft turned equally upon form and *feeling*: "To express the form of bodies, but without adding feeling, is to do one's duty only by half. To fuse these two parts (but what a difficulty!), that is the sublime in sculpture."³⁸ In short, the eighteenth century yields ample instances where aesthetic experience was conceived as heightened, intense, and *interested* in the sense of activating embodied responses to aesthetic objects.

Such a view from the ground, as it were, supports a crucial corrective to the familiar account of the emergence and development of aesthetics as a philosophical subfield in the eighteenth century. If, the story goes, we witness the pivotal reorganization according to which earlier reliance upon universal criteria for art was replaced, in an age of empiricist epistemology, with an attention to the subjective effects produced by art, this new focus, which

threatened to dissolve in an orgy of subjectivism, was immediately tempered by the imperative of rational disinterest. This two-step allows for a telos according to which Shaftesbury's *Characteristics* of 1711 has been connected with the Kantian apotheosis of disinterest in the *Critique of Judgment* from 1790. His imperative of disinterestedness tends to be understood as a primary, and pernicious, inheritance of the eighteenth century and the quintessence of what constitutes aesthetic experience.

Certainly, the widespread circulation of Kantian philosophy may be credited with having radically reconfigured medieval scholastic meanings (traces of which persist in Cartesian thought) of "objective" and "subjective," with the result that, by the mid-nineteenth century, the modern sense of "objectivity" as a basically epistemic goal had been consolidated. Immanuel Kant's reformulation of these terms "reverberated with seismic intensity" in all domains of intellectual life in the nineteenth century—even though this line of thinking was, to a certain extent, built upon the eighteenth-century sensationalist philosophers Kant dismissed.³⁹ Crucially, the nineteenth-century rise of post-Kantian objectivity was essentially yoked to its necessary counterpart in the guise of a new alertness to the "subjective self." It is in this sense that Kant underpins my account—less as the thinker who quashed subjectivity in the service of disinterestedness than as one who offered a powerful model for the imbrication of these terms in their modern construal. My study's chronological logic and argumentation acknowledges Kant's formulation as one that prompted a sea change in conceptualizing, and perhaps also experiencing, aesthetic encounter.

Eighteenth-century aesthetics and the imperative of "objectivity" have been understood as tendencies aided and abetted by the social and

architectural forms attendant on the rise of the modern art museum. Hans Belting has linked the founding of the Louvre with "a drastic and irrevocable change" in which "the contemplation of art" is replaced with "the retrospective contemplation of art history."⁴⁰ Here, Belting seems to channel Quatremère de Quincy, who, in his *Moral Reflections on the Purpose of Works of Art* from 1815, decried the rise of informed, rather than sensitive, beholders since artists desired "a public that feels, not one that reasons." In his view, the aim of the historical museum "is to kill art and turn it into history."⁴¹ I am interested instead in emphasizing a different eighteenth-century inheritance, one that recognizes that the call for disinterestedness was itself a symptom of the eighteenth-century preoccupation with aesthetic *receptivity*. Encounters with sculpture were central to this development and continued to be marked by affective expectations well after the rise of the universal art museum and the related expansion of art-historical thinking.

In the age of aesthetic theory, antique sculpture was embraced as a productive site for self-recognition and self-conception, as demonstrated in, notably, Étienne Bonnot de Condillac's *Treatise on the Sensations* (1754) and Johann Gottfried Herder's *Plastik: Einige Wahrnehmungen über Form und Gestalt aus Pygmalions bildendem Traume* (*Sculpture: Some Observations on Form and Shape from Pygmalion's Creative Dream*) (1778). Denis Diderot may well have had these associations in mind in his *Salon of 1765*, in which sculpture's connection to abstract philosophical reflection helped ensure its secondary position vis-à-vis painting.⁴² My study mines a particularly rich art-critical and philosophical literature that took up questions of sculpture and encounter: from Herder, Diderot, and Rousseau to Hegel, Hildebrand, Pater, and Lee. A central

contention here is that the importance of aesthetic experience can be traced not only through philosophical and explicitly art-theoretical writing but also in fiction, travel writing, and ultimately, if perhaps more speculatively, in picturing itself.⁴³ I propose that some of the most interesting thinking about the experience of ancient sculpture was articulated in two-dimensional depictions of encounters with such objects.

Baxandall's account of a cultural moment that may be perceived as Lockean suggests the broad currency of thinking about sensation and perception in the visual arts and provides a crucial point of departure for my study. In this historical situation, it is perhaps not surprising to find approaches to picturing that engaged antique forms not simply—to use Baxandall's Lockean terminology—as “substance itself” but rather as material that made itself “present, in the guise of sensation, perception or complex ideas of substance.”⁴⁴ This book trains its attention on precisely those pictures that thematize or take up in interesting ways the matter of seeing, perceiving, and experiencing in the round.

By the mid-nineteenth century, an emphatic opposition was strongly forged between ancient sculpture, as a key cipher of a deadening classical past, and the “painting of modern life.” However, such had not always been the case. Only decades prior, the sculptural antique occupied center stage in a series of interlocking discourses: on the nature of art and its history, on judgments of beauty and the cultivation of taste, and, indeed, on the nature and limits of human perception. Far from frozen morphological templates of ideality, Greco-Roman antiquities were explicitly volatile, as they were shuttled, for instance, from Italy to France and back again, even as they were conceived theoretically as the prevailing site of artistic and aesthetic transformation.

ANIMATING THE ANTIQUE

This historical lay of the land sets out the crucial ingredients for an eighteenth-century ontology of ancient sculpture, outlined in chapter 1, whose essential elements were mobility, mutability, and the capacity for encounters with the antique to yield potentially transformative experiences. Pictures of sculpture at the Capitoline Museum by Charles Natoire and Hubert Robert vividly summon mobility in terms of the actual movement of antiquities—their unearthing from the ground and their physical and conceptual movements from private to public collections. At the same time, Natoire and Robert take as their subject the mobility of consumers and beholders of art, who likewise would have been aware of antique sculpture's mobility as facilitated by its replication and circulation in reproductive mediums. In a remarkably evocative example, an engraving of the Apollo Belvedere by Giovanni Volpato and Raffaello Morghen, carefully annotated with measurements and observations by Antonio Canova, tells the story of how such prints traveled—in this instance, to the Vatican Museo Pio-Clementino, to be put into dialogue there with the represented sculptural artifact, and away again to the artist's studio.

As Canova's exacting notations attest, the question of the antique's mutability—its capacity for and subjection to formal modification—loomed large in an era in which canonical forms were reproduced in an unprecedented array of reproductive mediums: from plaster casts and cork models to bronze and lead. Mutability, in the sense of physical transformation, was likewise a fact of life of the antique in a period of accelerated archaeological excavation. Jean Grandjean's gripping drawing shows Andreas Christian Hviid pointing to traces

of restoration that had been made to the Capitoline Antinous prior to its public exhibition. The drawing thus evokes an era when unknown finds and canonical sculptures alike were often significantly transformed as they moved out of the ground and into networks of dealers, restorers, artists, and collectors. As attested by Blanchet's extraordinary series of grisaille paintings after such famed antiquities as the Apollo Belvedere and Venus de' Medici, mutability likewise entailed transformations wrought through the movement of sculptural form from three dimensions into two. Blanchet's singular depictions of the Apollo and Venus amid dying vegetation are among many instances that reveal the myriad possibilities for radically new stagings and affective scenarios.

Aesthetic experience often held out the possibility of transformative encounter. James Barry, who wrote from Rome about "that ardor, and I know not how to call it, that state of mind one gets on studying the antique," created, in his early *Self-Portrait with James Paine and Dominique Lefèvre* from around 1767, a picture of remarkable sensitivity to what was at stake in encounters with Greco-Roman sculpture in the age of aesthetic theory.⁴⁵ Summoning up the familiar form of the Belvedere Torso, Barry invoked the object's power as site of artistic inspiration in the setting of homosocial enthusiasm. By understanding the capacity of transformative encounter as central to eighteenth-century thinking about, experience of, and picturing of the antique, it is possible to recognize in Barry's painting the complexity of the artist's reflections on the antique, in which animation and petrification unsettlingly coexist.

Spanning roughly a century and a half, from the decades following the discoveries of Herculaneum and Pompeii to the turn of the twentieth century, *Animating the Antique* tracks a range of modalities of

animation, including Thomas Patch's depictions of sculpture's dangerously seductive allure (in chapter 1); J.-A.-D. Ingres's memories of atmospheric, torchlit views of sculpture and the rendering of anthropomorphic shadows (in chapter 2); Théodore Chassériau's phantasmic resurrection of Pompeian remains (in chapter 3); and Vernon Lee's distinctive theorizing of the experience of sculpture in the round in her "Gallery Diaries" (in chapter 4). Throughout, I aim to provide a richer account of the persistence of antiquity in the modern period by tracing the dialectic logic of the modern sculptural encounter, poised between the threat of mortification and the promise of animation and transformation.

Underwriting the roughly chronological organization of these chapters is an accordion logic, whereby the analysis expands both earlier and later in time around a central episode. For example, chapter 3 is anchored by a thoroughgoing examination of Chassériau's *The Tepidarium*, a large-scale canvas depicting Pompeii, whose genesis dates to the mid-nineteenth century. From here, the account folds backward, to the 1770s and the discovery in Pompeii of the famed "breast imprint," a negative sculptural impression in ash that captured the traces of a beautiful female torso. The chapter then moves to an analysis of Giuseppe Fiorelli's plaster casting techniques developed in the early 1860s and the emergence of photographic views of these modern "sculptures," culminating in reflections on how Norman Douglas, Wilhelm Jensen, and Sigmund Freud engaged Pompeii's uncanny sculptural capacities at the turn of the twentieth century.

By the final decades of the nineteenth century, substantial incursions had been made to the very idea of an enlivened and enlivening antique. Among the significant challenges to Winckelmann's and Hegel's vision of the antique, which insisted upon

its idealized, calm self-sufficiency, was Friedrich Nietzsche's fundamentally new articulation in *The Birth of Tragedy* (1872) of the concept of the Dionysian: the chaotic, passionate, instinctual, and savage. Nietzsche was particularly interested in moments in the arts of Greek antiquity, such as in the operation of the chorus in Greek tragedy, when the duality of opposing forces represented by "the Dionysian phenomenon" and the countervailing Apollonian mode were both in evidence, working as a structuring dynamic. Written contemporaneously with *The Birth of Tragedy*, Pater's biographical essay on Winckelmann celebrated the latter not for his clearheaded antiquarian knowledge but rather for his intimate and history-defying connection with Greek aesthetic and erotic sensibilities, forged, as Pater emphasized, through Winckelmann's appreciation of ideal antique bodily form.

Chapter 4 explores responses to fin de siècle challenges in the final decades of the nineteenth century, including Pater's essays on the origins and developments of Greek art and Lee's "Gallery Diaries." As in Pater's Winckelmann essay, Lee and Anstruther-Thomson aspired to reanimate the antique and, in so doing, to save it from its mortifying enframing in the museum and from deadening philological explanations alike. Instead, and with an eye to current debates among scholars of classical art and archaeology as well as to new developments in the psychological interpretation of objects and the study of *Einfühlung* (empathy), Lee and Anstruther-Thomson committed themselves to a radically embodied, empathic formalism.

Lee's work, rooted in movement and viewing in the round, is here considered relative to a long tradition of thinking through and picturing sculpture's sidedness. This tradition is explored in the guise of sculptural process via the words and hands

of Benvenuto Cellini, Michelangelo, and Edme Bouchardon; in terms of sculptural picturing as practiced in engravings produced by François Perrier and Antonio Canova; and in the relatively new medium of photography in the final decades of the nineteenth century. Around this same time, questions of sculpture's *Vielansichtigkeit*—the degree to which the object did or did not insist on multiple points of view—became vitally important to the historiography of ancient art and the understanding of sculpture, generally speaking.⁴⁶

The book concludes with a stark face-off between Lee and Anstruther-Thomson's insistence on sculpture's aspectivity and a quite different, very powerful vision of sculpture's essential planarity, a position articulated by sculptor and theorist Adolf von Hildebrand in 1893. The quick and formidable uptake of Hildebrand's vision of sculpture's planar imperative is attested by Heinrich Wölfflin's anxious reflections on the photographing of sculpture in 1896. These decades represent an endpoint for the dialectic logic that motivates this book. The 1880s and '90s stand as a decisive point, when art-historical and art-theoretical preoccupations and values congealed around the planar and the particular form of relief sculpture, marking a critical displacement of the figure in the round.⁴⁷ This shift marked the demise of a model that had, for 150 years, animated a productive dialectical interplay between the pictorial and plastic, the static and the mobile, the time of the antique and the time of beholding.

DESIRING ANTIQUITY

The instances I have found most gripping and ultimately the most productive for my work in tracing the afterlives of an eighteenth-century ontology of ancient sculpture have tended to be

those, to borrow a slightly modified phrase from Alex Potts, where the form and significance of ancient sculpture is not assumed to be self-evident.⁴⁸ From Blanchet's grisaille "ghosts" and Patch's dilettanti to Ingres's creepily suggestive shadows and Wölfflin's concerns about the "corruption" of improperly photographed "false impressions,"⁴⁹ I have tended to highlight artistic projects that entailed some degree of making strange and in which traces remain of the negotiation between experiences in three dimensions and their making over, anew, into two-dimensional depictions.

That strangeness also touches on questions of desire. If debates about early Christian antiquities in the second half of the sixteenth century reveal an antiquarianism informed by fervent Catholicism, the eighteenth century was marked by a strikingly different, and overtly secular, orientation to the antique world. From Winckelmann, Knight, and the Society of Dilettanti more broadly to Fuseli, the study of the antique was intimately bound up with questions of desire, which were articulated in a deeply libertine set of investments and commitments.⁵⁰ In a particularly evocative passage from *Plastik*, which Andrei Pop aptly describes as a "protoromantic manifesto," Herder summoned the experience of viewing the Sleeping Hermaphrodite in terms that reinforce this point.⁵¹ In a passage that zeroed in on the sculpture's power to channel overwhelming, even dangerously, all-consuming bodily desire, Herder wrote, "Whoever . . . stood before the famous Hermaphrodite and didn't feel in every bend and curve of the body, in everything he touches and does not touch, that Bacchic dream and hermaphroditism are the ruling forces, that he is awash in the torture of sweet thoughts and lust, pushing through his body like a mild fire—whoever did not feel this and did not discover in himself the

involuntary echo or resonance of these struck chords; to him neither my words nor any others can explain it."⁵² That the passage is marked grammatically by the equivocation between imagined beholder—"whoever . . . stood before the famous Hermaphrodite"—and the "he" of the represented subject—"awash in the torture of sweet thoughts and lust"—is crucial. Herder here develops a more general proposition that subtends his consideration of sculpture in his book: sculptural encounter turns on recognition, bodily resonance, and, in this case, mirroring. The Hermaphrodite episode is, in short, exemplary. And in its exemplary status, it highlights, rather than sublimates, the disconcertingly reciprocal terms that might be involved in sculptural encounters.

The fact that a powerfully charged desirous circuitry between male bodies held an exemplary place in Herder's discussion has not featured prominently in subsequent evaluations of his project. By contrast, Winckelmann's account of canonical ancient art was quickly recognized as bearing the traces of his marginalized sexual identity. By the early nineteenth century, references to "Winckelmann" operated as a sort of queer shorthand or literary handshake.⁵³ This association proved enduring; many decades later, Pater, following Goethe, invoked Winckelmann's "romantic, fervent friendships with young men," friendships that "perfected his reconciliation to the spirit of Greek sculpture."⁵⁴ It has become a commonplace in art history to recognize Winckelmann's importance, from his instrumental role in art history's disciplinary foundations to his pivotal contributions to encouraging the enthusiasm for ancient sculpture that took Europe by storm in the second half of the eighteenth century. Less clear by far is this: if we have come to recognize the

degree to which Winckelmann's project was underwritten by a particular sexual politics and turned on the author's orientation to an ideal of Greek same-sex desire, what purchase, if any, did these origins have on the subsequent embrace of Winckelmann's aesthetic and emulative priorities? In consideration of these questions, Whitney Davis has examined the sedimentation of taste from what we might term a Winckelmannian homoaesthetics, founded on "manifestly homoerotic prototypes and significance," to Kantian universalizing—and, thus, de facto *normalizing*—judgments.⁵⁵ Far from a marginalized position, Winckelmann here emerges as nothing less than the queer machinery undergirding eighteenth- and nineteenth-century canon formation.

Taking up the historical period that saw Winckelmann's eroticized admiration transformed

into "a virtually universal standard," this book traces the vicissitudes of canon formation in episodes that, again and again, conjure unruly desire—where desire appears to operate at a distance from the norms of gender.⁵⁶ The project of animating the antique notably hinged on such episodes, from the sodomitical logic of Patch's *Dilettanti in a Sculpture Hall* to desire made strange in Ingres's studies after the antique in the round, Chassériau's fantasy of female homosociality in Pompeii, and Lee and Anstruther-Thomson's work as sexual outsiders to constitute and manage embodied, desirous encounters with art. Taken together, the episodes that follow attest to the queerness to be found at the heart of the reception of the classical tradition, and in so doing, they begin to offer an answer to how we might otherwise conceive of the shape of Winckelmannian afterlives in art's history.

